

# **Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Chapman University**

## **Professional Services Division**

**April 17, 2000**

### **Overview of This Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at the Chapman University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

### **Accreditation Recommendations**

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for Chapman University and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Preliminary Internship
  - Professional
- Education Specialist Credential
  - Mild Moderate/Moderate Severe
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
- Pupil Personnel Services
  - School Counseling
  - School Counseling Internship
  - School Psychology
  - School Psychology Internship
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- The Chapman University be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The Chapman University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-2006 academic year.

## **Background Information**

Chapman University traces its origin to the founding of Hesperian College in 1861 by members of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), who wished to establish an educational institution in Northern California. In 1896, Hesperian College merged with Pierce College to become the Berkeley Bible Institute. Shortly after World War I, members of the Christian Church of Southern California moved this merged institution of higher learning to the Los Angeles region. Instruction began in 1920 in temporary quarters under the name of California School of Christianity. For the next third of a century, the school was located in Los Angeles where permanent buildings were erected on a newly purchased campus site. A name change to California Christian College occurred in 1923.

The decade of the 1930s was an exercise in survival, due to the great depression, reduced income, and dwindling student enrollment. During this period of continuing financial problems, the name was changed to Chapman College in 1934 because of a generous gift from C. C. Chapman, a prominent Orange County agricultural and community leader. World War II and the virtual disappearance of men on campus intensified the problems facing the college. The college made a temporary move to the Whittier College campus in 1942, where Chapman survived and maintained its identity. In 1945, the College returned to its Los Angeles campus where an essentially new faculty and student body had to be assembled.

The College relocated in the city of Orange in 1954 on the eighteen and one half acre, nine building property formerly home to Orange High School. This site has been transformed over the past four and a half decades by renovation, land acquisition and new construction into an attractive modern residential college campus of thirty-eight acres.

In 1958, Chapman began the Residence Education Center program (later called Regional Education Centers and now, Academic Centers) by providing educational services to military personnel on military bases. Although the changing demographics, both within the military services and the population at large, have resulted in alterations in the student population (civilians now comprise a majority of the enrollments) and center locations, the College's tradition of nearly forty years of service in this area has now made the Centers an integral part of the institution's overall mission.

Under the leadership of the current president, Dr. James L. Doti, the institution has redefined its mission as a small comprehensive university offering liberal arts and professional degrees that service the needs of the adult population, as well as the traditional age student population. The institution is organized into two colleges and six schools; the Wilkinson College of Letters and Sciences, the College of Lifelong Learning, the School of Business and Economics, the School of Communications Arts, the School of Film and Television, the School of Music, the School of Law, and the School of Education.

Among the key changes has been a commitment to significantly reduce Chapman's multi-state, multi-site academic center system as well as the number of degree/program offerings at these centers. In addition to the reorganization and consolidation of the Academic Centers, there has been a focus on upgrading facilities, substantially increasing the number of full-time faculty based at Academic Centers, and improving instructional resources, including library and information resources.

In 1991, the Education Department became the School of Education. This new status and visibility were granted as an acknowledgment of both the current and historical importance of education at the institution. The mission of the School of Education is to prepare inquiring, reflective, ethical and productive educators to work in public educational settings. The School of Education provides credential programs and master's level graduate degree programs on the Orange campus and through a system of 13 Academic Centers (18 total campuses), almost all of which are in geographic areas of California that traditionally have either not been served or have been under-served by institutions of higher education (e.g., Palm Desert, Victorville, and Palmdale in Southern California and Visalia, Santa Maria and Concord in Central/Northern California).

### **Preparation for the Accreditation Visit**

Because of the size and complexity of the visit, two Commission staff consultants were assigned to the institution in Spring 1998 and met with institutional leadership initially at that time. Over the next two years, there were numerous staff consultant meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone and regular e-mail communication was maintained between the staff consultants and institutional representatives. In May of 1999, the consultants met with the institutional personnel to develop a strategy for the review of the multi-site locations and consider the size of the team. In order to accomplish the strategy, the team size was established as twenty-eight team members and the visit was extended an additional day. Institutional personnel preferred to have the team and the faculty to gather at the Orange campus initially and then travel to off-site locations, returning to the Orange campus to finish the visit. The Team Leader was selected in July, 1999. However, in December 1999 she was appointed as a member of the Commission, thus disqualifying her. Dr. Randall Lindsey consented to become Team Leader for a second visit during this accreditation cycle. On February 8, 2000, the team leader and a staff consultant met with the representatives of Chapman University

to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details.

### **Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report**

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using the California Program Standards for all programs.

### **Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team**

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Institutional Representative, the Faculty and the Commission Consultants. It was agreed that there would be a team of twenty-eight consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of eight members; a Basic Credential Cluster of eight members, a Specialist Credential Cluster of three members, a Services Credential Cluster I of four members, and a Services Credential Cluster II of three members. The team was made larger than normal to accommodate the multiple sites throughout the state at which the institution offers programs. In addition, an extra day was added to the visit to allow travel time to fourteen campus sites, in addition to the Orange campus. The Institutional Representative and the Consultants assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultants then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic and Specialist and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues. During visits to the multiple sites, team members conducted interviews across programs.

### **Intensive Evaluation of Program Data**

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday April 2. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team. The institution sponsored a working dinner on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution. The clusters then held further organizational meetings.

On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 3-5, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in

the *Accreditation Handbook*. A unique feature of this visit was the added day to visit Academic Centers at fourteen locations. On Monday morning the team met at the Orange campus for meetings with program leadership. All 48 full-time faculty members from the Academic Centers were present and were interviewed by team members. Team members were assigned to one of eight groups to visit the Academic Centers. Each group consisted of one member of the Common Standards Cluster and one or more program cluster members, depending on the programs offered at the Centers. The eight groups traveled to Palm Desert, Visalia, Santa Maria, Victorville, Modesto, Concord, Monterey and San Diego. Separate interview schedules were developed at each Academic Center involving the required constituencies. Interviews were held in the late afternoon and evening. Each group reported back to the Team Leader at the conclusion of interviews on Monday evening.

On Tuesday morning and early afternoon, the groups were scheduled for school site visitations and travel to the next location. The groups traveled to Moreno Valley, Palmdale, Los Angeles, Ontario, Sacramento, and Fairfield. Two groups returned to the Orange campus to conduct interviews there. All groups conducted interviews at the second Academic Center in the same manner as the previous day. The groups then returned to Orange, arriving sometime between 8:00 p.m. and 10:30 p.m.

On Wednesday morning, the team met for two hours at the hotel to debrief from the interviews of the prior two days. The clusters met together and the team then held a meeting to identify areas in which additional information was needed. It was also a time to identify any standards that were in question subject to the gathering of additional data by the team. The team leader prepared a written summary of the team's discussion and presented it to the Dean of the School of Education at a mid-morning meeting. The team members then were taken to school sites or to the Orange campus to conduct further interviews, make telephone calls, examine supporting documentation, or begin writing the team report. The team met again at lunch to discuss the findings of the morning. At 1:30 p.m. a formal Mid-Visit Status Report was held. In this case, not much was added because of the earlier report given to the Dean. In fact, by this time, the institution was able to provide some of the requested information. The team left the campus at approximately 5:30 p.m. The clusters were requested to meet and be prepared for a team meeting at 8:00 p.m. During these work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters

Planning and implementing of the interview schedule was a very complex task. The staff at the institution worked many hours, both before the visit planning the schedule and during the visit adjusting the schedule, as needed. For example, because of a family medical emergency, the Cluster Leader for the Basic Credential Cluster had to withdraw from the team on Friday, too late to find a replacement, although Commission staff contacted three experienced team members to try to fill the vacancy. The Cluster Leader for the Services Credential Cluster I was a last minute cancellation on Sunday, because of illness. Other members of the team stepped into leadership roles and performed admirably. This left the interview schedule with some holes and required the institution to make some last minute adjustments, since the original schedule was short by two people. The Team Leader took the place of one of the absent members for Monday and Tuesday, but other adjustments had to be made in the

schedule. A total of 2200 group and individual interviews were conducted by the team members in the three days devoted to collection of data. Each team member made interview contact with approximately 80 interviewees in that time.

### **Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report**

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of “Standard Met,” “Met Minimally” with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or “Standard Not Met.” The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard. The team determined that two Common Standards were Met Minimally and all other Common Standards were fully met.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were less than fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas. Across all programs, only one standard was less than fully met, and it was met minimally.

The team included some “Professional Comments” at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

## Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The team discussed initial findings of the report on Wednesday evening and made a tentative accreditation decision. After the report was finished, the entire team met Thursday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that although two Common Standards were less than fully met and one program standard was less than fully met, the overall quality of the programs was good. The team did list some concerns, but did not feel that the concerns were of sufficient magnitude to make findings that any additional standards were less than fully met. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: “Accreditation,” “Accreditation with Technical Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations” or “Denial of Accreditation.” After thorough discussion, the team voted to recommend the status of **“Accreditation.”** The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION  
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

**Institution:** Chapman University

**Dates of Visit:** April 2-6, 2000

**Accreditation Team  
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

**Rationale:**

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, graduates, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the institution. The decision was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon. All Common Standards were judged to have been met, however, standards two and four were judged to have been met minimally.
2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in Multiple and Single Subject Programs, Pupil Personnel Services Programs in School Counseling and School Psychology, and Administrative Services Programs. In the Education Specialist Credential, all standards were met, except that standard 18, was judged to have been met minimally.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met, with two having been met minimally. The team further determined that there were numerous compensating strengths in the School of Education and that a stipulation should not be placed on the institution. Compensating strengths included consistent reports from employers across the state that graduates were well prepared, competent, and effective. The team concluded that all credential programs, across the state, were effective and generally of high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation. Although the team identified some few areas of concern in this report, the overall quality of the programs is good, and the University is demonstrating a commitment to continuous improvement.

**Team Leader:**  
**Randall Lindsey**  
University of Redlands



**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Terry Cannings**, Cluster Leader  
Pepperdine University

**Andrea Canady**  
Burbank Unified School District

**Mel Hunt**  
St. Mary's College of California

**Anne Chlebicki**  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Mary Williams**  
University of San Diego

**Judy Mantle**  
National University

**Charles Vidal**  
San Joaquin County Office of Education

**Wayne Kurlak**  
Redondo Beach Unified School District (Retired)

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Stacie Curry**, Cluster Leader  
Fowler Unified School District

**Peter Cheoros**  
Lynwood Unified School District

**Lawrence Pleet**  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Joel Colbert**  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Carla Eide**  
College of Notre Dame

**Cynthia Fernandez**  
Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School District

**Gloria Guzman-Johannssen**  
California Polytechnic State University, Pomona

**Specialist Credential Cluster:**

**Victoria Graf**, Cluster Leader  
Loyola Marymount University

**Peter Kopriva**  
Fresno Pacific University

**Nancy Tatum**  
Diagnostic Center of Northern California

**Services Credential Cluster I:**

**Dan Elliott**, Cluster Leader  
Azusa Pacific University

**Steve Van Zant**  
Chula Vista Elementary School District

**Beverly Neu**  
National University

**Douglas Smith**  
Grossmont Union High School District

**Services Credential Cluster II:**

**Kathleen Romig**, Cluster Leader  
San Juan Unified High School District

**Dale Matson**  
Fresno Pacific University

**Dione Brooks-Taylor**  
Point Loma Nazarene University

## DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog  
Institutional Self Study  
Course Syllabi  
Candidate Files  
Fieldwork Handbooks  
Follow-up Survey Results  
Needs Analysis Results  
Information Booklets  
Field Experience Notebooks

Schedule of Classes  
Advisement Documents  
Faculty Vitae  
Faculty Minutes  
Student Portfolios  
Evaluation Documents  
Master Teacher Handbooks  
Advisory Committee Minutes/Notes

## INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stand. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Specialist Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster I	Services Cred. Cluster II	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	5	111	92	24	48	27	<b>307</b>
Institutional Administration	4	105	39	5	22	2	<b>177</b>
Candidates		361	184	60	126	19	<b>750</b>
Graduates		125	74	46	37	9	<b>282</b>
Employers of Graduates		34	41	10	16	8	<b>109</b>
Supervising Practitioners		36	62	7	16	10	<b>131</b>
Advisors		48	25	16		5	<b>94</b>
School Administrators		35	29	6	18	3	<b>91</b>
Credential Analyst		13	2			2	<b>17</b>
Advisory Committee		117	82	18	22	3	<b>242</b>

**TOTAL**

**2200**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed. Interview numbers consist of both individual and group interviews, including entire classes of students in the programs.

## **Common Standards**

### **Standard 1 - Education Leadership**

### **Standard Met**

The School of Education has engaged in extensive planning, vision setting, and change processes over the last six years. The school faculty has integrated its efforts with the vision and mission of the university, and they have evolved their own values and beliefs of the characteristics of an effective teacher. Those values and beliefs have been integrated throughout the courses.

As the chief academic officer for the unit, the Dean is responsible for academic and administrative operations. His responsibilities are shared or delegated among two associate deans, two assistant deans, four credential program coordinators, two credential program co-coordinators, school and advisory committees, and faculty at large, to discuss and determine policy and program implementation. Specific roles are delineated for each of these parties. The Dean also coordinates administrative functions with the Dean of the College of Lifelong Learning and the Dean of Graduate Studies in that college. Administrators and faculty members play visible and important roles as educational leaders and decision makers throughout the university.

#### **Strengths**

The faculty, staff, and administration are to be commended for their focused and collective efforts to achieve a cohesive system of program delivery for their students. Regular monthly meetings of full time state-wide faculty have served to effectively address a variety of factors relative to program quality. The leadership team is to be commended for the stellar improvements in program quality since the last visit.

#### **Concerns**

With respect to governance, there were occasional delays in receiving the most recently revised course syllabi, including changes in textbooks, from some of the course custodians.

### **Standard 2 - Resources**

### **Standard Met Minimally Qualitative Concerns**

The university has restructured the staff at all Academic Centers to include full-time faculty, Program Coordinators, and Lecture Faculty Specialists. These positions provide continuity and enhanced service. Personalized instruction and service have been provided through small class size. Facilities have been improved and updated at most Academic Centers. The expanded and improved technology infrastructure has provided immediate access from each Academic Center to the Orange Campus through a frame-relay network. Virtual Libraries have been provided at all Academic Centers.

Students commented positively on the improvement in services provided in such areas as admissions, financial aid, and web accesses. This standard is judged to be met minimally with qualitative concerns given two major areas of need, student services and technology resources. First, the University is encouraged to continue improvements in responsiveness from the Orange County campus in service areas such as financial aid, credential analysis, admissions, and technology. Although staff

resources have been increased at Academic Centers, students expressed frustration with the delays in responsiveness from the Orange campus in such areas as financial aid support and credential support. Second, while the University is recognized for its growth in technology and web access, continued enhancements in infrastructure and technology assistance will be necessary for students, faculty, and staff to fully realize the vision of the virtual library and integrated technology in the instructional program.

### **Strengths**

Considerable faculty and staff resources have been allocated to the Academic Centers. Facilities have been upgraded and refurbished. The upgraded wide-area network infrastructure has provided increased bandwidth to allow for all staff on-line access and increased speed enabling effective communication. Each Academic Center has an on-line computer lab providing web access to students.

### **Concerns**

Although resources were allocated to recruit a more diverse faculty, staff, and student body, additional resources should be allocated to this effort so that the School of Education and the Academic Centers will more accurately reflect the demographics of the communities served.

Additional resources are needed to provide all faculty with technology equipment and accessibility for instructional purposes. For example, instructors need equipment to project computer screens for class viewing and demonstration. The technological initiative would be strengthened with additional equipment.

Although computer labs were available to students, some expressed concerns and frustration with the lack of technology support while accessing the virtual libraries both at the Centers and at their homes. Given the newness of the proxy server, students shared difficulties with acquiring access on their home computers despite the efforts of the University.

### **Standard 3 - Faculty**

### **Standard Met**

Full time faculty are qualified to teach courses and supervise field experiences in the credential preparation programs. Faculty are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. In fact, position advertisements from the last few years list 'sensitivity to cultural diversity,' and student interviews affirm this as a priority articulated by instructors in their courses. The SOE and University is also making a concerted effort to diversify its faculty through its position advertisements and directed recruiting programs. Full-time program faculty are brought together monthly from throughout the state to insure that full-time and part-time faculty are kept abreast of program developments. At monthly meetings faculty members (from the main campus and academic centers) meet in the program areas to develop faculty knowledge and expertise. In addition, at regional faculty meetings full and part-time faculty and Education Coordinators meet with Course Custodians to discuss best practices and review syllabi, describe new requirements, and conduct faculty development. The institution encourages faculty development (e.g., the SOE hosts a faculty retreat yearly in August that includes content workshops and team-building activities). The SOE also supports travel and sabbatical leaves. Course instructors and field supervisors are

regularly and consistently evaluated by students and at the end of each semester. All faculty have opportunities to evaluate courses. The SOE has a set of evaluation and continuation criteria for tenure track and term contract faculty review. Academic center full time faculty participate in a number of university committees and have a voting voice.

### **Strengths**

The team commends the School of Education for the monthly and regional SOE faculty meetings. Consideration could be given to involving support staff members in the regional meetings.

Student concerns about individual faculty performance appear to be consistently followed up by faculty and the administration at the academic centers.

### **Concerns**

The team notes that the diversity of full time and part time faculty at the main campus and academic centers does not reflect the diversity in the communities served by the university and encourages a continuation of efforts by the SOE to attract and retain qualified faculty from under-represented populations.

There appears to be a clearly articulated process for evaluation of faculty. A similar evaluation process is recommended for reviewing the Lecture Faculty Specialists (LFS) at academic centers.

## **Standard 4 - Evaluation**

### **Standard Met Minimally Qualitative Concerns**

The institution has recently developed a comprehensive plan for program evaluation. The initial steps in this plan, including course evaluations, exit evaluations, student satisfaction surveys, and employer surveys have been gathered, and some advisory committees have been convened, though the full plan has yet to be implemented. Both the SOE and the College of Lifelong Learning (CLL) collect and analyze the data related to their areas of responsibility.

The CLL evaluation system was initially used in the Spring of 1999 and is conducted each six months. Statistical analysis of the results indicates that there has been a continuous incremental improvement in student satisfaction in the areas of facility upkeep, computer labs, registration, and other administrative areas.

The SOE plan, adopted in November 1999, will not complete its first full cycle of program evaluation until the end of 2000. In the absence of evidence of the final stages of the evaluation process, the accreditation team believes that the standard has been met minimally with qualitative concerns. When the plan has been completely implemented as designed, the team believes the institution will have fully met the standard.

### **Strengths**

The PPS program instituted a comprehensive program revision based upon the evaluations received from a wide variety of input, including current students, employers, and other practitioners in the field.

**Concerns**

On the basis of interviews and the reviews of documentation, it appears that many of the academic center advisory committees were recently established. Some committees lack a clear understanding of their purpose and role. The evaluation these committees provide would be more effective if the institution gave them more direction and support.

**Standard 5- Admissions****Standard Met**

Each of the credential programs admits candidates on the basis of an articulated set of criteria and according to procedures that are clearly defined for the applicants and understood by the staff. Criteria for admission to the various credential programs include multiple measures: academic record, multiple professional recommendations, intake interviews, and grade point average requirements. While the college sets a minimum grade point average for admission to all credential programs (2.75), prospective candidates with a GPA between 2.5 and 2.74 may be considered for admission but are required to submit passing scores from a list of standard admission tests. Each of the program faculty is actively engaged in the process of reviewing candidates and candidates who do not meet the program standards are counseled out of the program.

The college continues to develop strategies to recruit students with diverse ethnic backgrounds and achieve a balanced representation of the population by gender and those with special needs conditions. The SOE has incorporated an exceptional admission category that considers fluency in a language other than English, instructional assistant/career ladder participation, or culturally diverse experiences including teaching overseas in schools as a basis for admission.

**Strengths**

The admissions process allows the SOE to make an effective assessment of a candidate's qualifications. The process is organized in such a way that it meets the professional interest and pursuit of its students.

**Concerns**

Recent data indicates that the SOE has attracted approximately 20% of its candidates from under-represented populations. A continued, but expanded, institutional commitment is needed to create a greater presence in established programs reflective of the communities represented by the university.

**Standard 6 - Advice and Assistance****Standard Met**

Chapman University provides qualified personnel to advise students regarding their academic, professional, and personal development and to assist in their professional placement as needed. Along with teaching, advising is one of the primary responsibilities and corresponding areas of evaluation for faculty members. Each credential candidate is assigned a primary faculty advisor who is responsible for advising and assisting the candidate. In addition, candidates at many of the academic

centers are provided with advising services by the Education Coordinator or other full time administrator. There is an initial orientation where each candidate is provided with appropriate information, booklets, pamphlets, catalogs, and application packets.

Each candidate also has a one-on-one admissions/intake interview where the program sequence and schedule is planned. Educ 401, a required prerequisite course, is another avenue where advisement and planning are provided. An exit interview is required of every candidate and each successful student then meets with a Credential Analyst or designated staff person to complete the credential application.

In order to assure that only qualified students are retained in the program, faculty continually monitor student progress. Regular checkpoints are provided in each program for evaluating student progress using a variety of means including grades, portfolios, and performance observations.

Generally the advisement programs appear to be quite strong. Current and former students needing assistance report being well served. The faculty and administration convey a dedication and commitment to their advisory responsibilities and do so by being available and flexible, promptly returning phone calls and E-mails, and giving out their home phone numbers. Students report that the orientation sessions and other advisory meetings tend to be complete, valuable, and thorough.



**Strengths**

The Chapman staff is to be commended for the sense of family that has been created and the personal, individualized attention that it gives its students. There is a feeling that, indeed, the student does come first. One student characterized it as: "Caring without Compromise." This philosophical underpinning leads to the creation of a culture of care among faculty and students which is embodied in the regular provision of advice and assistance for each student.

**Concerns**

The team noted that some students at the academic centers were experiencing significant delays in paperwork turnaround time from the Orange campus relative to credentialing, financial aid, and grade reports.

The team would also suggest that additional technology support be provided across all academic centers.

**Standard 7 - School Collaboration****Standard Met**

The SOE has established collaborative relationships with schools and school districts to assure proper clinical/field experiences. Each program within the School has acquired appropriate site placements for its clinical/field candidates. Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs have established lists of placements that offer a wide variety of teaching experiences. The actual delivery and supervision of these experiences have been complicated by the fact that so many candidates for credentials are, in fact, currently employed as classroom teachers. Thus, in many cases, there is no freedom regarding site selection. However, these teachers enroll in Educ 581, Supported Teaching, and receive on-going support from a university supervisor. Clinical/field experiences in other programs are tailored to the individual candidates and the current employment situation. Each program provides a handbook for use by district field supervisors.

**Strengths**

Chapman University is commended for the very positive perceptions of the School of Education that have been created in part due to the excellent relationships that have been established between the university staff and the practitioners in the field.

**Concerns**

None noted

**Standard 8 - Field Supervisors****Standard Met**

Each credential program in the SOE carefully selects district field supervisors. All practitioner supervisors are required to be appropriately credentialed and have at least three years of experience in their field. All programs have student teaching or internship handbooks. These handbooks specify the roles and responsibilities of all the people involved. The appropriate SOE personnel meet with district supervisors to orient them to their responsibilities as supervisors. These orientations occur as a part of the first three-way conversation among university supervisor, student, and field

supervisor. At the orientation, faculty provide field supervisors with documents necessary to the supervisory process and with the handbooks. Master teachers and students both reported these documents and the handbooks to be very helpful.

At the end of each field experience, students and SOE faculty both provide evaluative information which is intended to help the field supervisor enhance skills essential to this role.

Each practitioner supervisor receives a stipend for each field experience session.

**Strengths**

The SOE is to be commended for its part in the selection of district field supervisors. The students indicated they received a great deal of help and felt a strong commitment on the part of the field supervisors to quality assistance. Very positive thoughts were expressed by master teachers regarding their interaction with university supervisors.

**Concerns**

The team noted that the amount of the stipends paid to the master teachers varies from \$90 to \$185 across the different Academic Centers.

Recognizing that the identification of the district/site supervisors for the candidates teaching on emergency permits is a responsibility of the school district, the SOE should ensure that a mentor assignment has been made and students have been informed.

# **Program Standards**

## **Multiple Subject Credential Program CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)**

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Multiple Subject Program - CLAD/BCLAD with Spanish Emphasis.

Faculty in the School of Education encourage all students to adhere to high standards of professional conduct through course syllabi, classroom activities and personal models. Reflective journals and portfolios allow the students to assess their professional growth. Students build a sense of community through classroom presentations, sample lessons and discussion of peer comments.

The Multiple Subject Credential program has an excellent process for preparing candidates for a full credential. Students are given immediate feedback on their progress and assistance in improving their pedagogical skills. All candidates take Education 582 (directed teaching) regardless of whether or not they are currently teaching with an emergency permit. Finally, before a candidate is recommended for a credential, they must complete a professional portfolio and be interviewed by a committee of educators. Students, faculty and local school district personnel reflect enthusiasm in their praise of the Chapman program.

The reading centers offer an example of the opportunity students have to apply theory into practice and, at the same time, promote social responsibility through community work which reflects the vision of Chapman University.

Multiple Subject students are offered a strong program infused with diversity training and awareness of equity issues that begins with Education 401 and continues in a linear progression with Education 420, Education 421 and Education 570. Students reported they felt prepared to meet the needs of diverse populations of students.

### **Strengths**

The implementation of monthly statewide meetings with full-time and part-time Multiple Subjects faculty offer the unique opportunity to all faculty to discuss program design, development and implementation. Faculty benefit a great deal from sharing instructional strategies that help their personal and professional growth. The fact that all expenses are paid for faculty is in itself a motivating factor for participation.

Chapman University faculty should be commended for modeling student learning strategies, self-assessment strategies, and classroom student evaluation strategies throughout the multiple subject credential curriculum.

The faculty is to be commended for its commitment and dedication to students. At both the Orange Campus and the Academic Centers, faculty are available to students when needed for advisement and support.

### **Concerns**

None noted

## **Single Subject Credential Program**

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Single Subject Program.

Faculty in the School of Education through course syllabi, classroom activities and personal example encourage all students to adhere to high standards of professional conduct. Reflective journals and portfolios allow the students to assess their professional growth. Through classroom presentations of sample lessons and peer comments, students build a sense of community.

The Single Subject Credential program has an excellent process for preparing candidates for a full credential. Students are given immediate feedback on their progress and assistance in improving their pedagogical skills. All candidates take Education 582 (directed teaching) regardless of whether or not they are currently teaching. Finally, before a candidate is recommended for a credential, they must complete a professional portfolio and be interviewed by a committee of educators. Students, faculty and local school district personnel are enthusiastic in their praise of the Chapman program.

### **Strengths**

Chapman University faculty should be commended for modeling student learning strategies, self-assessment strategies, and classroom student evaluation strategies throughout the single subject credential curriculum.

The faculty is to be commended for its commitment and dedication to students. At both the Orange Campus and the Academic Centers, faculty are available to students when needed for advisement and support.

The implementation of monthly statewide meetings with full-time and part-time Single Subject faculty offer the unique opportunity to all faculty to discuss program design, development and implementation. Faculty benefit a great deal from sharing instructional strategies that help their personal and professional growth. The fact that all expenses are paid for faculty is in itself a motivating factor for participation.

### **Concerns**

Students are encouraged to use technology for research in the Single Subject program; however, syllabi did not reflect the integration of technology in all the courses or the systematic utilization of technology in the classroom.

The Single Subject Credential Program has recently begun to include teaching strategies appropriate for multicultural, multilingual students and is encouraged to continue to do so.

## **Education Specialist Credential Program Mild/Moderate/Moderate/Severe**

### **Findings on Standards**

The Level 1 Education Specialist Credential Program in Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities at Chapman University was recently approved by the COA. The program is to be commended for developing a collaborative model with the multiple and single subject programs. Based on candidate, faculty, employer and field supervisor interviews, document review, site visits and interviews with graduates of the former Specialist in Special Education Programs, Learning Handicapped and Severely Handicapped, the team determines that all standards are fully met, with the exception of Standard 18, Determination of Candidate Competence. This standard was met minimally with qualitative concerns.

**Standard 18, Determination of Candidate Competence** - The team did not find evidence that the program uses a systematic summative assessment process that references the credential-specific standards. Nor was there evidence of thorough documentation by field supervisors or site administrators regarding candidate competence and performance. The document currently in use lacks specificity regarding the components related to the Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Credential.

### **Strengths**

The program faculty is commended for assisting candidates during the transition from the former credential programs to the newly implemented ones.

In order to provide a quality program to candidates, program faculty initiated significant changes such as the reduction in the number of academic centers offering special education credentials, and the institution increased the number of full time faculty.

The faculty has been responsive to developing programs to meet the needs of the surrounding communities. Examples include transition programs and literacy programs.

The faculty at Chapman is highly regarded by peers, graduates, employers and candidates. The candidates and graduates who were interviewed expressed appreciation for the availability, accessibility, warmth and care provided to them. It was notable how frequently the students mentioned the level of support. Candidates also expressed appreciation for the quality of professional and personal advisement provided across the sites.

Students appreciate the small number of students in their classes. Many stated that they chose to enroll in this program because of the benefits they would receive by being in classes with small enrollments.

The school districts are high in their praise of the quality of the special education programs and the graduates. Some stated the applicants from these programs had an

advantage over other applicants when applying for a special education teaching position.

**Concerns**

None noted.

**Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program:  
School Counseling including Internship**

**Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program with a Specialization in School Counseling. The program has a strong theoretical and conceptual base that is well integrated with field-based applications. Faculty are highly qualified and work closely with practitioners to insure continuous improvement of the program.

**Strengths**

Faculty at all sites are to be highly commended for their strong commitment and dedication to the development and delivery of a more comprehensive PPS program.

The team noted the obvious personal interest and professional concern for the students. In turn, the approachability and extraordinary efforts to support the students in all aspects of their school development were greatly appreciated.

The greatest strength of the program is the Portfolio process. The students interviewed stated that the reflection process and the design of the portfolio itself, were most helpful in discerning individual growth and also assessment for improvement. As a result, both candidates and graduates were well informed about CTC standards and applications.

**Concerns**

Some evidence indicates the need for more academic support in the area of clinical and professional writing.

Formal recognition and possible remuneration should be considered for the on-site supervisors.

**Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program:  
School Psychology including Internship**

**Findings on Standards**

The PPS with a Specialization in School Psychology was evaluated according to the CTC Program Standards. The team finds the program to have met all applicable standards. The program has a strong theoretical and conceptual base that is well integrated with field-based applications. The internship component of the program is an appropriate professional experience that facilitates candidates' smooth transition

into educational settings. Faculty are highly qualified and work closely with practitioners to insure continuous improvement of the program.

**Strengths**

There are many strengths of the PPS program with emphasis in School Psychology:

Across the three academic centers, program directors are committed to quality programs with national standards as the goal.

The candidate population is drawn from a diverse pool of individuals with experiential depth. There was consensus that the faculty cared about them as individuals, fostered collaborative relationships, and responded to their concerns.

The quality of the program is demonstrated by the high rate of employment for graduates.

**Concerns**

On Standard 20 “Individual Development”, the curriculum did not appear to fully cover the explanation of human behavior from the biological perspective.

Formal recognition and remuneration should be considered for the excellent efforts of the on-site supervisors.

## **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, including Internship**

### **Findings on Standards**

Based on interviews of candidates, graduates and faculty and a review of documents the team finds that the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program meets all the applicable standards.

The Preliminary level program is centered on personalized service to emerging potential leaders of instruction. The program is values driven and strives to integrate theory with practice, so those leaders of schools are properly prepared to facilitate instructional planning and administrative leadership.

Strengths of the Preliminary level program begin with the highly personalized attention received by all candidates at all locations throughout California. Closely related to this is the consistency maintained through the use of master syllabi, consistent grading standards, and two-way evaluation of the courses and materials by candidates, faculty and program leadership. The concept of democracy in action frames the content for every course. The thread of universal empowerment is woven through all the learning experiences that Preliminary level candidates receive.

### **Strengths**

Major commitment by Chapman University Leadership has led to the provision of full time faculty and program level leadership at every academic center. This dramatic increase in faculty over four years is to be commended. The faculty and leadership of the educational administration programs make frequent mutual contact across the state and within each region to collaborate on the program courses, candidate assessment and faculty development. The formation of a statewide leadership team for the administration programs increases statewide coordination and assures consistency across the various academic learning centers.

### **Concerns**

In light of the current educational climate for accountability and “high-stakes” testing, it is a concern that the planned program of study may not adequately prepare future candidates in the area of assessing student learning outcomes.

## **Professional Administrative Services Credential Program**

### **Findings on Standards**

Based on interviews of candidates, graduates, and faculty and a review of documents the team finds that the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program meets all the applicable standards.

The Professional Administrative Services Credential program offers beginning administrators individualized development, coaching, and the opportunity to deepen theoretical understanding. Candidates are empowered to pursue practical solutions to challenges facing educational leaders in today’s schools. The program continues the theoretical strands introduced in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential



program. The four courses are augmented by significant research and development activities to solve problems and issues at each candidate's local school or organization.

Strengths of the Professional level program begin with the highly personalized attention received by all candidates at all locations throughout California. Closely related is the consistency maintained through the use of master syllabi, consistent grading standards and two-way evaluation of the courses and materials by candidates, faculty, and leadership. The concept of democracy in action frames the content for every course. The thread of universal empowerment is woven through all the learning experiences that Professional level candidates receive.

### **Strengths**

Candidates interviewed indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the empowerment afforded each through the courses and field application activities. Faculty interviewed expressed great satisfaction at the types of educational programs the candidates were implementing in their schools or educational organizations.

The process of getting through the program is well documented and guided by clear program handbook and materials.

Graduates ascribed the term "rigorous" to the courses they had taken in completing the Professional level program. This was certainly verified by an analysis of the course syllabi, instructor course outlines and other course materials.

### **Concerns**

The newness of the Professional level program, coupled with the large number of recently employed faculty and the geographic scope of Chapman University's instructional sites, requires continuing vigilance by faculty and the program leadership to ensure consistent quality, rigor and sensitivity to the needs of Professional level candidates.

## **Professional Comments**

*(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)*

### **Common Standards**

To fulfill the University's vision statement "*to be a leader in the state of California*," it is recommended that the university reevaluate the practice of hiring only contract faculty for the academic centers. If there is value in having tenure track faculty in the School of Education at the main campus, there may be value in having tenure track faculty at the academic centers.

The Accreditation Team recommends that the institution share the minutes of each center's advisory committee with the committees of the other centers to increase the coordination of the program evaluation and development effort.

### **Specialist in Special Education Program**

Based on interviews with candidates, the team suggests that increased attention be given in coursework to developing candidates' ability to write individualized education plans based on assessment information.

The team recommends that attention be given to providing more resources to develop a systematic technology plan that supports both faculty and candidates.

### **Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Program**

The PPS program with an emphasis in School Psychology fills an important niche in attempting to provide an adequate supply of well trained school psychologists to a profession experiencing chronic shortages.

### **Preliminary Administrative Services**

We recommend that the Chapman leadership team and faculty consider developing a tracking process for the field experiences associated with the courses and the 691 capstone field experience course. A pre-planning sheet signed off by the site supervisor, university supervisor and student may prove useful.

Frequent comments by candidates indicated concern over the age and quality of some text materials. The recent rapid growth in Chapman faculty may have left a gap in the understanding by the largely new faculty of the processes by which informed faculty could implement change in text and course materials to make them more current and relevant for use by candidates in the local regions. On-going faculty development efforts by the University and Program Leaders may correct this concern.

We recommend the faculty and leadership team thoroughly evaluate the preliminary level program of studies to provide greater emphasis in the area of assessing student learning. We suggest ED609 and Ed683 be reconfigured to provide a more comprehensive exposure to assessment of student learning.

### **Professional Administrative Services**

We encourage the Chapman leadership and faculty to continue careful planning and attention to the emerging professional level program across the various areas centers to ensure that the unique personalized needs of diverse entry-level administrators.